

CASE NO.: 1187-1.CIP
Serial No.: 10/600,314
June 23, 2005
Page 7

PATENT
Filed: June 20, 2003

Remarks

Reconsideration of the above-captioned application is respectfully requested. All pending claims (1-9) have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Sugimoto et al., USPN 5,461,231 in view of Schwarz, USPN 3,829,693.

The objections to the specification and drawings have been corrected herein.

Turning to the substantive rejections, the Office Action admits that Sugimoto et al. fails to teach or suggest that each of plural detectors has respective optics of differing focal lengths, attempting to supply the shortfall using Schwarz. The problem with this is that Schwarz teaches only one detector with two sides on which light can impinge, with each side of the same detector being provided with optics of different focal lengths. Ergo, combining Sugimoto et al. with Schwarz would not result in the present claims, but rather in what would result from the proposed combination, namely, two detectors as taught in Sugimoto et al. each one of which has two optics of differing focal lengths, but not having a focal length that is absent from the optics of the other detector as now claimed. To underscore this distinction, the amendments herein have been advanced.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully would like to offer the following observations. With respect to the allegation that Claim 2 (separate detector housings) is obvious appears to be incorrect. Sugimoto et al. teaches separate detector substrates but nowhere teaches or suggests the use of separate housings, and Schwarz appears to contemplate only one detector, certainly not multiple detector housings. In other words, simply because "detector housings are well known in the art" as alleged does not mean that separately housing two detectors of a single system is obvious; indeed, the lack of such a teaching militates toward the opposite conclusion (change over the prior art that prior art failed to recognize indicates that so-called "obvious

1187-1CP.AM2


CASE NO.: 1187-1.CIP
Serial No.: 10/600,314
June 23, 2005
Page 8

PATENT
Filed: June 20, 2003

choice" escaped the prior art, and thus is indicative of unobviousness, Fromson v. Anitac Printing Plates, Inc., 45 USPQ2d 1269 (Fed.Cir. 1997), *cert. den.*, 119 S.Ct. 56 (1998)).

The Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned at (619) 338-8075 for any reason which would advance the instant application to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



John L. Rogitz
Registration No. 33,549
Attorney of Record
750 B Street, Suite 3120
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 338-8075

JLR:jg

1187-1CF.AM2